

Monthly Status Reporting Revision Working Team

Meeting Minutes

DAY: 11/15/06
TIME: 11:00am - Noon
LOCATION: 3900 Conference Room 39A

Meeting Called By:	Gaye Mays		
Meeting Purpose:	Discuss project status indicator settings & alerts		
Attendees:	Gaye Mays – EPMO Steve Tedder - EPMO David Butts - Wildlife Resources Commission	Bob Giannuzzi - EPMO Barbara Swartz – Strategic Initiatives Richard McGee – EPMO/QA	Greg Jones – Crime Control Lucy Cornelius – DHHS Manny Zech – DOT Jim Tulenko- Strategic Initiatives
Unable to attend: David Butts, Greg Jones, Manny Zech			
Meeting Documents:	PPM Project Status Indicator Settings Guidelines (Jelly Bean chart)		
Attachments:	N/A		
Next Meeting:	11/28 @ 1:00PM (Tentative)		

Discussion Points

1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPM Project Status Settings Guidelines (Jelly Beans) – this topic was deferred until our next meeting. Steve Tedder and Lucy Cornelius will draft suggested changes to the “jelly beans” guidelines for discussion by the team. • Manual submission of status reports – discussion took place on how this process could work if agencies were allowed to submit status reports they are already completing internally in lieu of the PPM tool report. The EPMO QA group is open to this suggestion as long as all pertinent project areas are addressed. Lucy Cornelius advised that the report format was not as much of an issue as the difficulty with entering the information into the tool; all team members were in agreement. There are too many fields and tabs to update. Improvements in this area would be a long term solution. Jim Tulenko advised that some degree of report format changes can be handled by his team. It may be possible to add optional fields to the current PPM status report that agencies could use to report information specific to their environment. An additional “executive level” summary report may also be possible. A question was raised as to requiring status reporting while in the “Initiation” phase. • Other topics discussed: <i>Earned Value</i> – should be considered as a requirement of status reporting at some point in the future. <i>Meeting schedule</i> – the team discussed moving our meetings to Tuesday and meeting every two weeks instead of weekly.
2	<p>“Top 10” problems/issues identified with current process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Difficulties with using the PPM tool/overall inflexibility 2. Tool should measure triple constraints (scope, cost, schedule) but currently does not measure these accurately 3. Project schedule measurement is “time consumption” rather than an “earned value” type metric 4. Under utilization of resources is viewed as a negative 5. Need to more clearly define milestones to make them more meaningful 6. PPM tool does not accommodate the conceptual phase of a project, thus when the project meets the criteria to be input into the tool, the level of detail required may be difficult to capture and the PM must complete a number of “catch up” status reports 7. PPM tool does not accommodate other development methodologies such as “Agile”

	8. Cannot see appropriate detail in current tool status report i.e. detail on issues and risks 9. Limited capacity for comments and ability to reference historical information 10. Resource management is not integrated into UMT tool. Difficult to accurately reconcile time for all resources.
3	Project Approach & Updates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define audience for monthly status reports –<i>representative agencies have defined the audience status reports are prepared for in their agency; the PPM tool status report is primarily used by the EPMO QA group</i> Define elements that should be included in status reports Define/evaluate status codes (red, green, yellow, etc.) and alerts Collect example reports already in use – <i>in progress</i> Formulate recommendations – identify “quick wins” and long term requirements

Action Item Updates

1	Validate audience for EPMO monthly status reports – Gaye will discuss with Sharon Hayes – <i>Sharon advised that the current monthly status reporting process is designed to provide project information to facilitate the QA process.</i>
2	Draft suggested changes to “jelly bean” parameters – Steve Tedder & Lucy Cornelius